

### **REMARKS**

In the above-mentioned Office Action, all of the pending claims, claims 1-20, were rejected. Claims 1, 7, and 11-12 were rejected under Section 103 (a) over the combination of Lynch and Ulrich. Claims 2-6 and 9 were rejected under Section 103 (a) over the combination of Lynch, Ulrich, and Bucknell. Claims 13 and 15-17 were rejected under Section 103 (a) over the combination of Lynch, Kaplan, and Ulrich. Claim 8 was rejected under Section 103 (a) over the combination of Lynch, Ulrich, and Friend. Claim 10 was rejected under Section 103 (a) over the combination of Lynch, Ulrich, Bucknell, and Friend. Claim 14 was rejected under Section 103 (a) over the combination of Lynch, Ulrich, Kaplan, and Bucknell. Claim 18 was rejected under Section 103 (a) over the combination of Lynch, Ulrich, Kaplan, and Friend. And, claims 19-20 were rejected under Section 103 (a) over the combination of Lynch, Ulrich, Kaplan, and Zirnstein.

In the rejection, the Examiner continues to maintain the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on the teachings of Lynch in view of various other prior art references. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Lynch appears to be directed towards a system for copying configuration settings from a first computer currently used by a user to a second computer. Paragraphs [0013]-[0015] of Lynch indicate that the disclosure is directed towards providing the same look and feel of the first computer to the user when the second computer is used. In order to effectuate the copying of configuration settings from the first computer to the second computer the first and second computers are scanned to detect the configuration settings. The configuration settings on the first computer are then copied to the second computer to mimic the look and feel of the first computer (Lynch paragraph [0042]).

The Applicant respectfully asserts that Lynch does not suggest or teach Applicant's invention. Assuming for comparison purposes that the first computer of Lynch is the home node of Applicant's invention and the second computer is the mobile node, Lynch would teach the

scanning of the home node to reconfigure the mobile node so that the user would have the same look and feel when running email applications on the mobile node. Moreover, Lynch never suggests and in no way teaches making changes to the first computer (the home node in Applicant's invention) as claimed by the Applicant.

Additionally, the system as described in Lynch, requires that the first computer be scanned and that configuration settings be provided. If the configuration settings of the first computer are not determined they can not be copied to the second computer and the second computer will not have the same look and feel. Lynch does not suggest or teach configuring the second computer (let alone the first computer as argued above) without configuration settings from the first computer. The present invention, in contrast, provides for reconfiguration (of the home node) in either case. The Examiner provides paragraphs [0012], [0015], [0079], [0081] and [0082] as support that Lynch teaches the second element of Applicant's independent claim 1. The Applicant respectfully disagrees and fails to see how the invention disclosed in Lynch can be practiced in the case where configurations settings from the first computer are not provided.

The Examiner also points to Lynch paragraph [0060] for support that Lynch teaches the third element of Applicant's independent claim 1. In paragraph [0060] Lynch teaches two scenarios for effectuating changes to the second computer. In the first scenario the first and second computers are running on the same platform and the second computer is configured using unchanged settings from the first computer. In the second scenario the first and second computer are running on different platforms and the configuration settings must be converted to the platform of the second computer. In Applicant's claimed invention only the home node (not the mobile node) is being reconfigured so such a distinction between platforms is moot and does not provide any teaching of Applicant's claimed invention.

Application No. 10/789,404  
Amendment dated May 26, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of March 26, 2009

The Applicant respectfully asserts that Lynch does not teach or suggest the claimed invention and thus the claims are allowable over Lynch under the non-obvious requirements of §103. The claims are believed to be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-20 is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Kelly/

---

Robert H. Kelly,  
Reg. No. 33,922

KELLY & KRAUSE, L.P.  
6600 LBJ Freeway, Suite 275  
Dallas, Texas 75240  
Telephone: (214) 446-6684  
Fax: (214) 446-6692  
[robert.kelly@kelly-krause.com](mailto:robert.kelly@kelly-krause.com)